



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mentally, its value depends largely upon what the individual probation officer does for the particular persons entrusted to his care. No system without constructive, discriminating, individual work can operate well. The great surgeon is the man who has devoted himself earnestly to his profession and has brought to it right altruism, high intelligence, earnest zeal, and all the powers of his personality. Probation is a difficult profession, demanding skillful service. Entrusted to the man or woman who merely looks upon it as a political job, probation is doomed to failure. No matter how swift and powerful an aeroplane may be, it will never give maximum service to an army unless directed by the skillful hand of a trained airman.

Should we not, therefore, approach our task with great humility, with a proper respect for its difficulties and with a true appreciation of its opportunities? Should we not by training, reading, and conference, endeavor to acquire all of the knowledge which will help us to do our work more effectively? Should we not endeavor to learn from all agencies and individuals the truths which they have discovered in their respective field and which we can utilize in our own? Should we not give a careful study to the relative merits of different methods of applying probation, and improve our case treatment in the light of such study? Should we not approach every individual probationer with a conscientious determination to give him the best service of which we are capable, realizing that his future is largely in our hands?

A broad vista of opportunity stretches before us. The probation officer is primarily a builder of human character, a force for the betterment of social life. As yet the community is not fully alive to our work nor does it realize clearly just what the probation officers are attempting to accomplish in their daily work. The day of this realization, however, is approaching us swiftly, and with it will come progressive rewards and recognition of the dignity of our public service. Those who have visited the battle fronts of the Great War have come back impressed with the wonderful efficiency which our forces are showing in the struggle. More impressive, however, than the machinery which has been put into action are the splendid human qualities of loyalty, co-operation, precision, orderliness, self-sacrifice, and spiritual devotedness evinced by the officers and men—the same qualities which you and I know to be essential to effective probation work.

As we do our work from day to day and make tests of our individual output, let us make sure that back of our efforts are the courage and loyalty and conception of the greatness of the task which alone can produce the highest efficiency. Let us respect the great constructive work in which we are engaged. Let us always remember that its code of ethics is based upon the true service that we owe and wish to give humanity. A wise philosopher once said that the only wealth is life. In our fallible human way we are trying to give a more abundant life to those unfortunates of society who come under our care.—E. J. Cooley, Chief Probation Officer, New York City, in Proceedings of National Conference of Social Work, 1918.

Annual Report of Chief Probation Officer of Cook Co., Ill., to the Judges of the Circuit, Superior and Municipal Courts.—The sixth year of adult probation in Illinois has found this department in better shape than ever before. The office is better organized; the officers better fitted because

of experience for the work they have to do; and the people have more confidence in the system.

Conservative management with close attention to details has made the department very efficient in dealing with both those accused of domestic offenses and those found guilty of crimes in our Criminal Court.

There has been no change in the law or the policy of the office during the past year. We have urged upon the judges the necessity for an investigation in each case, prior to probation, so that they would know the three important things before granting defendants the benefit of the law: First, the man's residence and his home surroundings; second, his work record; and third, his criminal record, if any. In support of that theory we made an investigation of all the cases, except those on probation, from the Domestic Relations' branch of the Municipal Court, which were discharged during the last fiscal year.

The total number of investigated cases show only 12 per cent discharged unsatisfactory, but those not investigated show 27 per cent unsatisfactory. To a student of probation, the details are interesting.

During the past year we have had quite a large number of cases from the Domestic Relations' Court and comparatively few cases from the Morals' Court of Chicago—366 cases placed on probation by Judge Dolan were nearly all admitted to probation while he was presiding in the Boys' Courts—Judge Fisher (389 cases) were admitted practically all of them while he was presiding in the Morals' Court. Judge Stelk (709 cases) were substantially all of them admitted while he was presiding in the Court of Domestic Relations..

The success of the Domestic Court is in a large measure due to the judge's firmness in insisting upon his orders being carried out, to the work of the court attaches, and the persistent work of the probation officers in forcing the defendants to pay their wives the amount ordered by the court. If the probation officers did not keep after these men, there would be a large deficit in the amount received by their wives and children.

As I have said many times before, they are the worst cases we have to handle and require three or four times as much work as any other class admitted to probation.

We believe that the department has been a great help to the wives and children of the "domestic slackers" in Chicago. As I have said before, we only get on probation those cases which others have given up as beyond redemption.

Mrs. McGuire, the social secretary of the court, has said many times that she does not wonder that we have trouble with these men. What with their mental weaknesses, their continual heavy drinking, and their quarrels with their wives and their wives' relatives—their utter selfishness in thinking only of themselves and not of their wives and children, we have a real job to do in order to get results.

We do not claim that we are exceptionally successful, but we do think that, under the conditions, we have done very well—certainly the Domestic Relations' Court would not be of so great value to the community were it not for this department.

There will be found in the statistical part of this report a statement from the officer in the Boys' Court, of conditions found there during the past several months, but not for the whole year.

The total amount in fines paid under the installment plan of the probation

law amounts to \$2,449.50 and costs, \$1,536.96, a large increase over last year.

We had on probation September 30, 1917, 621 more cases than one year ago—a large increase to be cared for by a department not well supplied with help.

The earnings of probationers have increased more than \$737,000.00 over the amount given last year. The restitution obtained has increased more than \$29,000.

The Employment Bureau has, without much difficulty, been able to place everyone who is willing to work. The report of that department will be found elsewhere, but it shows that we secured employment for 1,038 people; not all of them, however, got the positions.

Eighty-seven of the men on probation never went to the place to get the positions—eight women who were on probation never went to the place for work.

Of men *not* on probation—that is, positions obtained for people from other departments of the county government—forty-eight failed to go to get the position—women numbering fourteen failed to go to get the position offered them.

As a matter of fact, 878 people were given jobs.

We have 1,975 investigations for the judges. A good many of the persons investigated were not put on probation, because the judge found from our investigation that the defendant was not either morally or legally entitled to it.

There will also be found on page number 15 a statement as to the men with previous police records, those having been on probation before (in cases other than domestic), and those having been on probation before for non-support, or, as we call them, “domestic repeaters.”

In that same table it shows the number of women with police records, admitted to probation, and the number of repeaters.

The department has felt the effect of the war in that we find a large number of those on probation have either enlisted or been drafted. In numerous cases we have to make arrangements with the government for the purpose of having a part of the salary assigned and set off for the benefit of the wife and children, and many of them are now financially better off because of the enlistment of the husband and father than they were before; thanks to the help of the Red Cross!

The male members of the department are none of them young enough to be drafted or to enlist, but quite a number of the officers have contributed their share through their family—seven sons of officers have joined the Army or Navy. The officers and probationers are doing their bit toward helping the Nation win the war.

Some persons have misunderstood our statistics in that they have assumed that all the cases discharged as “unsatisfactory” are those having again violated the law. That is not true. Listed under that head are those who have committed another offense and have been punished—those who have failed to pay the full amount of their restitution—those having left the state without permission, and those having moved without leaving any trace, those having committed slight infractions of the law and, being brought in by the officer, were discharged.

We are glad to state that this last year the courts have been dealing with probationers violating their probations, with more firmness and are insisting

upon the conditions of their probation being carried out. In this way, better results are obtained and a larger percentage of improvement shown.—John W. Houston, Chief Probation Officer.

MISCELLANEOUS

Committees of the Institute—Appointed for 1918 to 1919.—

Committee "A"—Insanity and Criminal Responsibility.

Victor Arnold, Judge of the Juvenile Court, Chicago, Chairman.

Orrin N. Carther, Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois, Springfield, Illinois.

George A. Patrick, Alienist, Chicago.

Edgar A. Singer, State Psychiatrist, Kankakee, Illinois.

Sidney Kuh, Alienist, Chicago.

Burdette G. Lewis, Commissioner of Charities and Correction, Trenton, New Jersey.

Committee "B"—Probation and Suspended Sentence.

Edith Abbot, School of Civics and Philanthropy, Chicago, Chairman.

A. C. Backus, Judge Municipal Court, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Miss Minnie F. Low, 18 Selden Street, Chicago.

Homer Folks, Yonkers, New York.

Joel D. Hunter, United Charities, Chicago.

Maclay Hoyne, Prosecuting Attorney, County Building, Chicago.

John H. Whitman, Superintendent of Prisons, The Capitol, Springfield, Illinois.

Committee "C"—Classification and Definition of Crime.

Ernst Freund, University of Chicago, Chicago, Chairman.

Eugene A. Gilmore, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Robert W. Millar, Northwestern University Law School, Chicago.

Nathan William MacChesney, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago.

Samuel K. Dennis, United States District Attorney, Baltimore, Md.

Committee "D"—Modernization of Criminal Procedure.

Robert W. Millar, Northwestern University Law School, Chicago, Chairman.

Edwin R. Keedy, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia.

William E. Mikell, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia.

Quincy A. Myers, former Chief Justice of Supreme Court of Indiana, Fletcher-American National Bank Building, Indianapolis.

Joseph P. Rogers, Court of Common Pleas No. 2, Philadelphia.

E. Ray Stevens, Ninth Judicial Circuit Court, Madison, Wis.

Lawrence Veiller, Secretary of Committee on Criminal Courts of the Charity Organization Society, 105 E. 22nd Street, New York.

Robert J. Wilkins, King's County Children's Court, Brooklyn, New York.

Charles C. Nott, Judge Court of General Sessions, New York.

Edward Lindsey, Pennsylvania Bar, Warren, Pa.

Committee "E"—Crime and Immigration.

Miss Grace Abbott, 920 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Chairman.

Miss Kate Claghorn, School of Philanthropy, New York.

Robert Ferrari, of New York Bar, 2 Rector Street, New York.